1-1-1960

A Comparative Study of Eucharistic Teachings of the Didache with Canonical, Early Christian, and Non-Christian Literature

Joseph Richard Bennett

(This certification-sheet is to be bound with the thesis. The major professor should have it filled out at the oral examination.)

Name of candidate:

Joseph Richard Bennett

Oral examination:

Date May 18, 1960

Committee:

Professor S. Marion Smith, Chairman

Professor Henry K. Shaw

Professor George Stuart

Thesis title:

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF EUCHARISTIC TEACHINGS OF THE DIDACHE WITH CANONICAL, EARLY CHRISTIAN, AND NON-CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

Thesis approved in final form:

Date May 18, 1960

Major Professor S. Marion Smith

(Please return this certification-sheet, along with two copies of the thesis and the candidate's record, to the Graduate Office, Room 105, Jordan Hall. The third copy of the thesis should be returned to the candidate immediately after the oral examination.)

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF EUCHARISTIC TEACHINGS OF THE DIDACHE WITH CANONICAL, EARLY CHRISTIAN, AND NON-CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

BY

Joseph Richard Bennett

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree
Master of Arts

Division of Graduate Instruction
Butler University
Indianapolis
1960

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In this study it is not the author's aim to attempt to cover the field pertaining to the origin and development of the Eucharist. A vast number of competent works have been written on the subject, but the primary purpose here is to examine the Eucharistic teachings of the Didache in the light of Canonical, early Christian, and non-Christian literature, in an effort to determine if the Didache presents the Eucharist (or Lord's Supper) in its original form as practiced in the primitive Christian Church of the first century. Further, we propose to show how the simplicity of the act was developed into a crystallized rite, or sacrament, by the time of the second century Church.

When we consider the origin and development of the Eucharist (or Lord's Supper) the matter resolves itself into the question: Did Jesus ever contemplate the establishment of the Supper as a Sacrament or was it a process of development and growth? To answer the question one must journey back into Hebrew history as it is there that the roots and early development of the institution are to be found. It was upon these Hebrew roots that the simplicity of the Lord's Supper developed by the time of Tertullian into the complex rite of a Sacrament. There is little evidence that Jesus ever contemplated the establishment of the Supper as a Sacrament for the term,

"sacrament," did not come into use in connection with Christian rites until about 200 A.D. when the Church used the term in reference to certain external rites or ritual observances through which peculiar spiritual benefits were received by the participants.

With this brief introduction, let us now turn to a detailed study of the beginning of the Eucharist as practiced by the first century Church.

CHAPTER I

EUCHARISTIC ROOTS

It is always difficult to trace any one institution back to the point where it actually originated; for as soon as a certain factor is isolated as the beginning of any event, there are found to be many factors that have been leading up to the point mentioned. Each of these factors fits in a logical order and sequence and the point of origin that has been selected as the beginning of the institution in question assumes its place as one of the events in the whole scheme or order.

When we begin to talk of the origin of the Eucharist or the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the problem which confronts us is where are we to begin. For example, some scholars trace the beginning of the Eucharist back to the Semitic people while others go back to prehistoric people and their meal habits. An example of the latter position is presented by J. A. Magni in his dissertation, The Ethnological Background of the Eucharist. He contends that "extensive researches have revealed the fact that eucharistic rites reach back into the dim, prehistoric past of the race."[1]

---

[1]J. A. Magni, "The Ethnological Background of the Eucharist" (published Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Psychology, Clark University, 1936), p. 1.

> . . . Surveying the Appoline, Dionysiac, Orphic, Soma, Haoma, Semitic, Mithraic, Aztec, and Peruvian cults one discovers sacramental rites or faint traces of such in all of them. The remarkable thing is that all, however far apart in space or time, embody as their basic idea the prescientific notion of sympathetic magic. Primitive man believed that the qualities of a person or thing could be transferred by mere contact. But the surest way to assimulate such qualities was by eating and drinking. Now, whatever object was believed to be embodiment of the deity was therefore sacramentally eaten for the purpose of absorbing the divine attributes, and for renewing or strengthening the physical bond between the tribe and its totem god. In the earliest stages of human culture any material benefits were naturally sought, and the most efficacious means was then believed to be the eating of living flesh of a human being and the drinking of its warm blood. In a more advanced civilization, the theanthropic animal, as less repulsive took the place of the human victim. Crudely enough the deity was supposed to take part in this cannibalic sacrament. Later the god's share was sublimated and etherealized by being burnt on the altar.[2]

While Magni contends that the roots of the Eucharist can be traced to prehistoric peoples and times, other scholars contend that the roots of the Eucharist as practiced in the primitive Christian Church are to be traced back into Hebrew history and the celebration of the Passover meal. As William Robinson wrote in his book, Completing the Reformation: "Whether the Lord's Supper was actually instituted at a Jewish Passover, or a special chaburah on the eve of the Passover, it was redolent with Passover associations."[3]

> As the Jewish Passover celebrated the redemption from bondage in Egypt, the Lord's Supper celebrated the New Covenant redemption from the bondage of sin. As the Jewish Passover celebrated the redemption to a new life for Israel

---

[2] Ibid.

[3] William Robinson, Completing the Reformation (Lexington: The College of the Bible, 1955), p. 49.

> under the Law of Moses, which was summed up in love to God and love to man; so the Lord's supper celebrated redemption to the new life of freedom and liberty for the "New Israel" with no racial limits, under the law of Christ, which was summed up in love to God and to all men.[4]

It is with this latter view in mind that we shall proceed with the study of the Eucharist as related to the Feast of the Passover.

Reviewing the Last Supper as it was celebrated by Jesus and the disciples to find the factors and incidents which led to it, we can find the roots of the Supper in the Feast of the Passover. Old Testament literature makes quite a number of references to the Passover. Exodus refers to it in chapters 12:1f, 21-27, 43-49; 23:18; and 34:25. Leviticus has a reference in chapter 23:5; and Numbers, in chapters 9:1ff; and 28:16. Deuteronomy mentions it in chapter 16:1-8. The prophet, Ezekiel, has a reference in chapter 45:21ff of his book. Other references are found in Amos 5:21, 8:10; Hosea 2:11, 9:5, 12:10; Isaiah 30:29; Joshua 5:10; II Kings 23:21-23; II Chronicles 8:13-30; 35:1-19; and Ezra 6:19f.[5]

In many instances the accounts of the Feast are similar. In all probability the best account of the Feast is given by the priestly writer in his account dated approximately 500 B.C. and found in the twelfth chapter of the book of Exodus. In this account, Jehovah is represented as having spoken to Moses and Aaron to tell them that the month of April was to be the first

---

[4] Ibid., p. 58.

[5] W. J. Moulton, "Passover," Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1900), p. 684.

month of the year for all Israel. On the tenth day they should take a lamb for every house--a lamb without blemish--which should be kept until the fourteenth day of the month when it should be killed. The blood should be sprinkled on the two side-posts and on the upper-post of the houses wherein they did eat for it would be a token, and the Lord would pass over that house when He smote Egypt with the plagues. Following, should be the Feast of the Unleavened Bread, which should be kept from the fourteenth to the twenty-first of April.[6]

However, the sixteenth chapter of Deuteronomy also specifically mentions the Feast and its observance is required since, in the month of April, Jehovah did bring the children out of Egypt. It is to be remembered that Deuteronomy was in all probability written in the second half of the eighth century or in the early seventh century. This date is deduced from the mention of certain forms of worship in the book which were not likely to have been in practice before that period. Whether the Feast was observed at the time this document was written cannot be stated definitely.

During the reign of Josiah, who was ruling the Southern Kingdom of Israel, the Deuteronomic Code, which had been lost for a considerable period, was found in the Temple of Jerusalem while the Temple was being repaired and cleaned. This incident marked the renewal of the worship of Jehovah again. Hilkiah, the high priest, made the discovery and turned it over to Shaphan who, in turn, delivered it to the king. Learning the

---

[6]Ex. 12:1-28.

contents of the book and being assured of its authenticity, Josiah immediately began his reforms. One of his major reforms was the institution of the Passover: "Keep the Passover unto the Lord, your God, as it is written in the Book of the Covenant. Surely there was not held such a Passover from the days of the Judges that judged Israel, nor in all the days of the Kings of Israel, nor the Kings of Judah."[7]

The Ezekiel account of the Passover is practically contemporary with the Priestly Record, the date of Ezekiel being approximately 592 B.C. Generally speaking, it is very similar to the reference in the Priestly account.

Thus, from these accounts, it is evident that the Feast was regularly observed prior to the time of the Priestly account in 500 B.C. Certainly it existed from 621 B.C. Whether it existed before this time would involve a scientific study of the Old Testament references stated above and their documentary sources. It is certainly reasonable to assume that the Feast continued to be celebrated from 621 B.C. through the early Christian era.

This observance approaches as nearly to the idea of a sacrament as anything found in Jewish religion. It does not rise, however, to the full definition of a sacrament since the Jew had no thought of any vitalizing power of God flowing unto him through this channel. Still this observance does influence God since the commemoration of God's great goodness in the past

---

[7]II Kings 23:21-22.

pleases Him and keeps Him propitious in the present. This observance was, therefore, a means of Grace and not a sacrament.

The celebration of the Passover Feast from the time of the Deuteronomic Reform, in 621 B.C., to the early Christian era is an accepted fact. It is also to be believed that Jesus, being a good Jew, rigidly observed the Feast of the Passover. There are two specific references in the Synoptic Gospels that bear out the fact that Jesus adhered to the Jewish custom. The first incident related was early in his life. When Jesus was twelve years old his parents went up to Jerusalem, after their custom every year, to observe the Feast.[8] Thus, Jesus was trained from the age of a child to practice the ritual of his Jewish parents and their religion.

The second record of Jesus celebrating the Feast of the Passover is near the end of his life and is mentioned in all of the Synoptics. In the Synoptic account, Jesus' disciples had asked where they should prepare the Feast of the Passover as it was the season for it. They were directed to the city to the house of a man whom they should identify with a pitcher of water. In the house, the upper room should be prepared for the meal that Jesus and his disciples would enjoy together.[9]

The season of the last Feast of the Passover was used by Jesus to institute the Lord's Supper. While they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it and brake it, and gave it to them saying, "Take, eat, this is my body." And he took

---

[8]Luke 2:41-42. [9]Mark 14:12-16.

the cup and when he had given thanks he gave to all of them and they drank all of it. And he said, "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many."[10]

There is no mention in any of these passages of the Synoptics that would lead to the belief that Jesus at this moment was instituting a sacrament. There is little doubt that he was speaking symbolically and was leaving behind him a memorial that could be celebrated in his absence and in his honor. It is true that Matthew 27:28 states that the blood was shed "for the remission of sins." However, since this author is the only one making such a statement, it is quite probable that it was a later insertion. Bruce considers the phrase as probably a comment on Christ's words supplied by Matthew.[11] Bacon prints the words in bold-faced italics, believing them to be a correction or addition made by the evangelist or redactor.[12] The institution is an outgrowth of two important thoughts that were no doubt running through the mind of Jesus. First, he was in the midst of a setting and a season of the year when the Pascal Lamb was being offered. This fact was, without a doubt, of tremendous importance to Jesus. However, the second thought was probably more important. He was reflecting on the coming events of his own life which would be required soon of him on the cross. He, himself, would be offered up even as the Pascal

---

[10] Ibid., 22-24.

[11] A. B. Bruce, "Matthew," Expositor's Greek Testament, ed. W. R. Nicoll (6th ed.; New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., n.d.), III, 312.

[12] Benjamin W. Bacon, The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate (2d. ed.; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918), p. 327.

Lamb was offered--not in the same manner--yet he thought of his own life as being necessary for a sacrifice.

Jesus was very much concerned about his leaving this world, but he was more concerned about those whom he was leaving. It had been his life's work to try to impart the true life to men; his own life was the model. He, himself, had the life-giving power that he was offering. Is it not logical to believe that as he sat for the last time with his closest followers that he should use the life-giving elements of bread and wine in a symbolic manner? We would not take the words, "Take, eat, this is my body," in a literal interpretation. Jesus is speaking figuratively; he uses the elements of bread and wine as symbols for the life that he wishes to give.

At this point it will be well to note a discrepancy in the chronology of the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics.

The Fourth Gospel clearly indicates that Jesus did not partake of the last Passover. It also leaves out any record of Jesus having instituted the Lord's Supper. Perhaps the author assumed, at the time of his writing, the existence and the reader's knowledge of the Supper and its origin and purpose. The Fourth Gospel does make reference to a supper which occurred the evening before the last Passover and is considered by some scholars to be the same Last Supper referred to by the Synoptics.[13] This chronology would fix the

---

[13] J. A. McClymont (ed.), "St. John," New Century Bible (New York: Henry Frowde, n.d.), p. 26.

time of the crucifixion not on the day following the Passover, as related in the Synoptics, but on the day of the Passover Feast itself.

It is not difficult to harmonize this series of events with those related in the Synoptics. Nevertheless, some modern scholars are inclined to accept the Johannine narrative. They believe that the authors of the Synoptics have moved forward the time of the Passover Feast in order that it might serve as a basis for the institution of the Lord's Supper.

It will be noted that this section of the thesis is based on the Synoptic record, since it is generally accepted as the more historical record.

After the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, those who were his followers waited patiently for the Comforter which had been promised to them. On the ninth day after Jesus' departure, the Holy Spirit came with a great noise and like tongues of fire. Immediately after this experience, Peter preached his famous sermon which resulted in three thousand converts. With these converts the Christian Church was organized.

The followers of Christ had continued to break bread and drink together. Each time, that they did so, they were reminded of the solemn moment when Jesus had broken bread in their presence and had pronounced the bread, his body, and the wine, his blood. Whether Jesus had commanded it or not, the followers felt that they were doing just as Jesus would have

them to do. Thus, they continued to have fellowship with one another; the breaking of bread and the remembrance of the scene in the upper room, inevitably, took on the character of a memorial feast.[14]

As the churches grew and converts were added, the same custom of observing the memorial feast was practiced. However, it did not continue to have the same atmosphere of quiet and solemnity that Jesus gave to it or that the disciples must have given it in their observance. At Corinth, it took on all the attributes and characteristics of a feast. In fact, St. Paul said that it could not be the Lord's Supper that they observed. The main thought of each one was satisfying his own appetite. Elaborate and extravagant preparations were made, in many cases beforehand, for the meal that was to be served. The rich, carrying an abundance to eat and to drink, hurried to the place where the meal was to be consumed, being very intemperate in the quantity that they used. The poor, who could not bring much, if anything, stood around unable to participate and received little attention. Those who had brought their own food consumed it themselves. Much of the sickness and illness was attributed to this gluttony by St. Paul, who took the Corinthians to task for their over-indulgence.[15]

---

[14]Arthur C. McGiffert, History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923), p. 69.

[15]Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians," International Critical Commentary (2d. ed.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916), pp. 263-68.

When Christianity came into the world it found pagan and mystery cults already existing. Scholars have stated that these religions have had an influence on the institutions and sacraments of Christianity. Some of these statements, however, have been refuted. Christianity, in its origins, appears as an outgrowth from Judaism and not from the Mystery Religions.

It is admitted that there are similarities in both types of religions. They have voluntary membership, bodily washings, acts of eating and drinking; it is to be noted, however, that these are merely initiatory acts through which the candidate must pass. The differences in Christianity from the pagan religions are of most importance. Christianity has been associated with the Hebraic influence and not the pagan. It was in its beginning closely connected with the synagogue, for it paid homage to One who came down from heaven to establish a world brotherhood and who died for the love of men. "It also took on the Hebrew conception of righteousness and moral goodwill; its sacramental meal possesses a significance and is an important element and act in the service of worship."[16] The Christian Eucharist is an outgrowth of the Jewish Passover and was originally celebrated on the occasion of a chaburah meal just prior to the time of Jesus' crucifixion.

Any observance by the Mystery Religions of common meals was possibly affected by the Christian Sacraments rather than vice versa. There seems to be little room for the conclusion

---

[16]Edwyn Bevan, "Mystery Religions," The History of Christianity in the Light of Knowledge (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929), pp. 83-115.

of some scholars that the Eucharist was founded on pagan rites; the rise of Christianity was unique and separate from those of the Mystery Religions. The close association of Christianity with Jewish origins would seem to lessen any argument that it was predominately influenced by paganism or shaped according to the rites and cult meals practiced by the pagan religions of the first century of the Christian era.

In this chapter the author has endeavoured to trace the roots of the Eucharist to its simple beginning and to bring to light the fact that Jesus did not institute the Lord's Supper as a sacrament but shared the elements of bread and wine with his disciples as symbols for the life that he was to give for them. As we turn now to the second chapter of the study, we shall see how this simple ceremony, by the time of the writing of the Didache, was being developed by the Church into a rite or sacrament. It is to be noted that the Didache does represent the Eucharist in its simplest form, but it, at the same time, sets forth requirements that were binding upon those who were to participate in the service.

CHAPTER II

EUCHARISTIC TEACHINGS OF THE DIDACHE

The Didache, or The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, has been acclaimed as one of the greatest discoveries in the second half of the nineteenth century. The manuscript, dated 1056, was discovered, together with other valuable early writings, by the Orthodox Metropolitan Bryennios at Constantinople in 1873 and published by him ten years later.

There is a very natural and active interest on the part of almost every student of Christianity in any discovery that promises to throw light upon the beginnings and early years of Christianity and especially upon the figure of Jesus. The Didache purports to be an instruction based on sayings of the Lord and given by the Twelve Apostles to pagans who wished to become Christians; therefore, it created a concern of sixty years ago among students similar to the concern of today over the Dead Sea Scrolls.

It is the practice of scholars when any new discovery in ancient literature is brought to their attention to inquire as to the form in which it was found; to scrutinize its material, whether papyrus, parchment, or paper; and "to examine the writing with an eye to determining its date, and in general to interrogate . . . a series of particulars

bearing upon the all-important question of its genuineness."[1]

The Didache " . . . is cited by Clement of Alexandria in his First Stroma; by Eusebius, who speaks of it (HIST. iii 25) as τῶν Ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι Διδαχαί ; and by Athanasius in 39th Festal Epistle."[2]

> Paul Sabatier insisted that the document presented such vivid marks of primitiveness and genuineness, especially in the eschatological character of its piety, that it was to be dated before the gospels, as early, he declared, as 50 A.D.[3]

The Didache has been edited many times and critically investigated by scholars of all lands, but no agreement has been reached as to its date or the sources of its composition. In fact, the date of composition has been a warmly debated problem; it has been placed by capable critics in every decade of the century from A.D. 50 to A.D. 360. For example, Paul Sabatier dated it 50 A.D. while, at the other extreme, some scholars pointing to a late doctrinal development placed the compilation in the fourth century and inquired only whether it was pure romance or a fiction containing but a substratum of reality. J. A. Robinson came to the conclusion that the manual was to be taken not "as representing the Church of his own time or place, but rather as an imaginative picture of

---

[1]Edgar J. Goodspeed, Strange New Gospels (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931), p. 3.

[2]Roswell Hitchcock and Francis Brown (eds.), Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884), p. iii.

[3]James Muilenburg, "The Literary Relations of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" (published Ph.D. Dissertation, Graduate School, Yale University, 1926), p. 3.

the primitive Church, as it was planted by the Apostles in Gentile lands."[4]

Among scholars the Didache has been regarded as the work of a single author from beginning to end, as a composition of the first century which has been modified by subsequent interpolation, or as the elaboration of a Jewish manual of instruction for proselytes which has been adapted and expanded for Christian use. Its historical importance has been variously estimated according to its assignment to an earlier or a later date, but with hardly an exception scholars have regarded it as a document of the highest value for the history of early ecclesiastical institutions.

Another factor concerning the Didache, which is one of great debate, is centered in the question of the site of composition. Some of its statements seem to suppose a small town or rural community, but we are still left to conjecture whether a Syrian or Palestinian, or an Egyptian provenance. Syria is suggested by the hint of a possible lack of running water needed for baptism, by the warning against "the hypocrites," and by the mention of the grain scattered on the hills. Other considerations favour Egypt as the place of composition: the testimony of Clement of Alexandria (Strom. I. 20. 100. 4); the popularity of the Didache in Egypt; and the finds of Greco-Coptic papyri.[5] There are certain factors

---

[4]Ibid.

[5]James A. Kleist, Ancient Christian Writers (Westminister: The Newman Press, 1948), p. 4.

which point to Antioch, that important Syrian center of paganism, as the place of composition. Syria, center of paganism, was evangelized about 42 or 43 A.D. The Apostle Paul concluded his first missionary tour about 45 or 48 A.D. It was at that particular time that the problem of catechizing pagans came to the foreground and pressed for a solution. In 49 or 50 A.D., the Apostolic Council looked into the matter and laid down the decrees as given in Acts 15:28ff. We can be reasonably sure that about this time some uniform method of catechizing pagans was worked out. Now, it is noteworthy that the very title of the Didache connects, at least, the first tract in one way or another with the "Twelve Apostles," and it is not rash to conclude that it was their method of catechizing that found its way into the Didache.[6] "When this happened we do not know; but since the Didache offers somewhat modified form of the Apostolic decree (see 6:2 and 3), some time must have elapsed between the year 50 and the date of composition."[7]

Internal evidence of language and subject matter indicates that the Didache is perhaps one of the earliest extant pieces of Christian literature exclusive of some parts of the New Testament. It, seemingly, was written in the period from 80 to 120 A.D. Chapters nine, ten, and fourteen give us the oldest elements of the Eucharist service. However, it is noticeable that in none of these references is any mention made concerning the institution of the Eucharist.

---

[6] Ibid., p. 5. [7] Ibid.

The content of these passages reveals three prayers of thanksgiving. In chapter nine, there is the exhortation of the expression of thanksgiving for the cup: "We give thanks, Our Father, for the holy vine of Thy son David, which Thou madest known unto us through Thy Son Jesus." The second prayer follows the broken bread: "We give Thee thanks, our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou didst make known unto us Through Thy Son Jesus; Thine is the glory for ever and ever."

The third prayer, set forth in the tenth chapter, is for all God's mercies, spiritual and temporal, with a prayer for the Church Universal. Between the second and the third prayer is a sentence which discriminates between those who should and those who should not participate in the Eucharist: "Let no one eat or drink of this eucharistic thanksgiving but they that have been baptized in the name of the Lord." It is to be remembered that the Agape and the Lord's Supper itself were so closely associated with one another in this period that it is hardly possible to distinguish between them. Consequently, some scholars are inclined to question which part of the service the discrimination is made against. Placed between the second and third prayers, some have said that its meaning applies to the Agape only; others have said that it is applicable to the Communion service itself, which must certainly come after the second prayer and before the third prayer. Philip Schaff in his book, Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, is of the opinion that the phrase is applicable to both parts

of the service. He is, in all probability, correct when it is remembered that these two parts of the service were inseparable. Any application of it to the Agape alone would place the Communion after the third prayer which certainly could not be the case for the third prayer seems to be strictly post-Communion. From its context, the prayer expresses thanks for spiritual food and drink, and life eternal through Jesus Christ.[8]

It is from the third prayer, after the elements have been consumed, that we are able to draw a particular doctrinal teaching. This is found in the words: "Thou, Almighty Master, didst create all things for Thy name's sake, and didst give food and drink unto men for enjoyment that they might render thanks to Thee, but didst bestow upon us spiritual food and drink and eternal life through Thy Son." "This statement, like some made by Ignatius, contains therefore, the Johannine conception of the Supper."[9] The Eucharist in the Didache is spiritual food and drink taken with a consciousness of the presence of the Lord giving in return life eternal.

The third reference to the Eucharist in the Didache, found in chapter fourteen, indicates the time and manner of celebration of the rite. On the Lord's Day the bread is to be broken and confession made for transgressions. Disputes between

---

[8]Philip Schaff, The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (3rd ed.; New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1889), p. 23.

[9]Reinhold Seeberg, Textbook of the History of Doctrine, ed. Charles E. Hay (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1905), p. 24.

participants in the Eucharist must be reconciled beforehand. In this section, too, the above requirements are necessary that the sacrifice of the participants may be pure. Harnack brings out the fact that payments in kind were necessary for the Agape, connected with the Supper, and from these were taken the bread and wine for the holy celebration. Also, this presentation of the elements for the ordinance was extended to the offering of gifts for the poor who, in this way, received them directly from the hand of God. "In these respects, therefore, the holy ordinance appeared as a sacrifice of the Community and was named εὐχαριστία, a sacrifice of Thanksgiving."[10]

Supposing, from an examination of the internal evidence of language and subject matter, that the Didache came into existence before the end of the first century, it is needful at this juncture of the study to compare the Eucharist teachings of the Didache with those of the New Testament. From the text in Luke 22:17-19, it appears that the Last Supper was patterned on a Jewish feast in which a cup opened the meal. This account is in agreement with that of the Didache which has the cup before the bread. In two of the Synoptics and the writings of Paul, the bread and wine order is brought out distinctly after the mention of the cup; it is to be noted that here the meal described is strictly Eucharistic. In Acts 2:42, 46-47, and 20:7-12, speaking of "the breaking of the bread" sheds no light

[10]Adolph Harnack, History of Dogma (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1897), I, 209.

for us on this particular problem; however, from the statement in I Corinthians 11:17ff, it is "clear beyond doubt that we are here in the presence of a common meal united to the Eucharist. And it is clear that the Eucharist does not precede the meal."[11]

Pursuing the text of Luke 22:17-19 in comparison with the teaching of the Didache, which presents a Jewish feast in which a cup opened the meal, we note that it is highly possible that the Lord's Supper was instituted in the setting of a common or communal Jewish meal rather than in the Passover setting. At first, the Lord's Supper seems to have been accompanied with a fellowship meal called "the chaburah--as this meal was to be shared in common by all the guests."[12] The chaburah, or "love feast" as this meal was sometimes called, was one familiar to the Jews and centered around the act of "breaking of bread together." It is possible that the name, "breaking of bread," may be the earliest name for the Lord's Supper. It came from the ritual act of the "house father" breaking and blessing bread at the beginning of a meal.[13]

As to I Corinthians 11:17, it is clear that the Eucharist does not precede the meal; therefore, as far as the New Testament is concerned, we "conclude definitely both the existence of an ordinary community meal in the primitive

---

[11] Ibid., p. 11.

[12] Robinson, op. cit.

[13] Ibid.

church and its union with the Eucharist."[14]

The oldest Palestinian form of the Lord's Supper was celebrated by the Christians daily, communally, and as a complete meal of cultic character. This practice disappears very soon in the further development of the Church, especially when Christian congregations spread into the Hellenistic-Roman environment. Soon the Eucharist, or Lord's Supper, was observed once a week, on Sunday, and a little later it ceased to be celebrated as a complete meal. It became the Eucharist with bread and wine.

It is with reference to the old Palestinian form of the Lord's Supper as a common meal that the similarity between the meal-prayer in the Didache and the teaching of Luke 22:17-19 is significant. Just as the blessing of the bread and the wine stood at the beginning of the meal in Luke, so it is also at the beginning of the meal according to the Didache, chapter nine. While it is admittedly a fact that the Didache has the blessing over the cup before the blessing over the bread, the decisive similarity lies in the fact that both stand at the beginning of the meal.

At this point, it is to be remembered that the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper in Mark 14:22-24 stems directly from the tradition of the primitive Palestinian Church, while the accounts in Luke 22:19-20, and I Corinthians 11:23-35, is a later production of the Hellenistic

---

[14]Krister Stendahl (ed.), The Scrolls and the New Testament (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957), p. 11.

Christianity.[15]

The account of the Synoptic Gospels referring to the Eucharist are in agreement from a general point of view, but they are not identical in detail. The account of Mark is considered basic, and the account by Matthew rests on Mark and additional sources. As has been previously stated, the account by Luke reverses the order of the bread and cup and in some accounts includes the statement, "This do in remembrance of me." This statement is considerably questioned by certain scholars. Westcott and Hort had such strong doubts about it that they excised it from the Lucian account in their translation of the Greek New Testament.

A possible explanation for the differences of Mark and Matthew's accounts of the Eucharist in comparison with those of the Didache and Luke lies in the fact that the former represent the Eucharist in its earliest form, while the latter give evidence of the development of the Eucharist into a rite or sacrament. This, seemingly, is evident by the fact that according to Mark's Gospel no command was given by Jesus to continue with the celebration. The eschalotogical outlook of Jesus was that the world order was at the point of dissolution and the end might arrive at any moment. To provide, therefore, a long continuing movement of this kind would be without a basic purpose.

The eschatological aspect of the Eucharist is brought

---

[15] Ibid., p. 67.

to light in chapter ten, verse six, of the Didache. It reveals the fact that the early Christians were actually yearning for "the end of the world" and the παρουσία, or coming of the glorified Christ. It is not difficult to explain the word, "Grace," that appears for it is but another name of Christ. The celebration of the Eucharist was deemed a suitable moment for this yearning for, through the Eucharist, the glorified Christ was believed to actually come into the hearts of the faithful. This explains the rapturous joy with which the Christians hailed His final coming by two well-known eschatological texts:

> "Hosanna to the God of David" and "Maranatha"! It follows immediately that the intervening sentence, "If anyone is holy, etc.," shares the eschatological character of the context. When the glorious Christ returns to take His elect home with Him to the Father (John 14:3), then "whoever is holy," that is, "a Christian," may confidently come forward to meet Him; but if anyone is not a Christian, "let him be converted" and become a Christian. Thus the much-discussed imperative ἐρχέσθω is an encouragement to the Christians in the group to persevere in the faith, and to the unbaptized an exhortation to submit to baptism.[16]

The Eucharist while still celebrated by the Jerusalem Church as part of a daily meal was not a remembrance of Jesus' death but, as has been stated, was the eschatological expectation of the Parousia, the return of the Lord. Therefore, the daily meal of the primitive Church is a joyful act, the eschatological exultation, in view of the redemption close at hand. Later the Hellenistic Church took over the practice of the meal from the Palestinian Church with the entire treasury of the Sayings of Jesus. It also received the twin parable

---

[16]Kleist, op. cit., p. 9.

from his last meal: "This is my body . . . This is my blood shed for the 'totality.'" This tradition preserved in Mark was not from the beginning a "cult formula" but became such later. I Corinthians, second chapter, gives us a clue to what happened: The double logion became associated with the cult meal of the Church, and the tradition preserved in Mark 14:22-24 takes on the function of a cult formula. Theologically the meal undergoes a considerable change. While it had originally a tone of exultation in expectation of the eschatological banquet, it now becomes a remembrance of the atoning death of Jesus.[17] "As often as you eat . . . you proclaim the Lord's death." In this change of emphasis, Jesus' explanatory words take on the role and the significance of words of institution.

However, a close study of the Pauline text indicates that these two Palestinian traditions--the daily meal practice and the account of the last meal--were not woven together just by adding the one to the other. The cult formula is not applied to the whole meal but to an act which we may call the Eucharist proper, celebrated with bread and wine.[18] This distinction between the meal and the Eucharist is also found in the Didache. The meal, first, is described in chapters nine and ten followed by an introduction to the Eucharist; the Eucharist, itself, and the word pertaining to it are omitted since they were to be kept secret. At a later date, the Eucharist, as the cult proper, becomes detached from the congregational meal and attached to

---

[17] Stendahl, op. cit., p. 85.

[18] Stendahl, op. cit., p. 88.

the principal morning service. The celebration of the evening meal continues for a while separately as the "Agape."[19] In Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition, chapter 49ff, the Agape is still called "cena dominicia," the Lord's Supper.

Still, it remains an unanswered question when the meal and Eucharist were welded into that unity which I Corinthians, the eleventh chapter, portrays. Paul is not responsible for the combination; he has "received it" as tradition (I Cor. 11:23). Furthermore, Paul can give still another meaning to the Eucharist: " . . . participation in the body of Christ; as the bread is one, so we, the many, are one body," (I Cor. 10:16ff). The partaking of bread and wine in the Eucharist gives the Church its sacramental union as the body of Christ. This interpretation is in the line of Hellenistic sacramental thought and indicates a later stage of development. Yet, it is already a part of the tradition that was passed on to Paul as was the cult formula itself. As early as A.D. 40-50, i.e., within fifteen years after the death of Jesus, the account of the Last Supper had become a cult formula, which in its turn opened up new ways of interpretation.[20]

In all probability the Didache is one of the oldest existing non-canonical pieces of literature. It brings us to the point where the New Testament ends. In it, as in the New Testament, the order of the Old is still strongly preceptible. Its chapters on Church organization are still reminiscent of

---

[19] Ibid., p. 89. [20] Ibid.

the primitive conditions met in the works and writings of Paul. All through the Didache we seem to hear the words of the Apostles, themselves, speaking to us as the title indicates--The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.

The Codex Hierosolymitanus, discovered by Bryennios, contains the only known manuscript of the Didache in its present form. However, textual control is possible to a large degree because of the presence of a varied auxiliary tradition. Thus, a large part of the Didache was incorporated into patristic writings and early Church manuals, i.e., the Epistle of Barnabas.[21] "The Oxyrhynchus Papyri have yielded two valuable fragments (1:3-4 and 2:7-3). The six first chapters have survived in a Latin translation (?) of the third century; a number of passages have been preserved in Coptic, Arabic, Ethiopic, and Georgian documents."[22]

---

[21] Kleist, op. cit., p. 13.

[22] Ibid.

CHAPTER III

THE EUCHARIST IN THE CANONICAL LITERATURE

Having traced the background of the Eucharist, we can examine more fully some of the statements in canonical literature in search for the attitudes that prevailed among the authors of a few of these works. The simplicity of the Eucharist now begins to crystallize into the rite or sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

The celebration of the Lord's Supper by the Corinthians had become so extravagant and intemperate that Paul, while he was still in Ephesus, felt disposed to write the Corinthians about this wrong and many other social evils in which they were indulging. His eleventh chapter of First Corinthians, verses seventeen through thirty-four, indicates his attitude.

That Paul regarded the Supper as a memorial feast and related to the eschatological conception of the Christ is evident to the most casual reader. He even tells the Corinthians that the words of Jesus were: "This do in remembrance of me, for as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come."[1] His message on the Sacraments in this chapter is an effort to have the Corinthians leave off the selfish indulgence and understand the real

---

[1]Herbert J. Andrews, "The Place of the Sacraments in the Teachings of St. Paul," The Expositor, VIII (March, 1916), 361-62.

meaning of the Supper in a different light than merely one of gross intemperance.

There is little doubt that the commemorative theory may have still been maintained had Paul only made these statements in chapter eleven about the Supper. In chapter ten, however, Paul makes an even more significant statement. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ?" These words are important in the fact that they were introduced incidentally as part of the argument that Paul was making against sacrificial worship to idols and demons. It may also be assumed that these words represent not merely the Apostle's personal view but they represent, as well, the view of the Christian Church of his day.[2]

Another interesting point that Paul makes in this passage is his analogy drawn between the Eucharist and the pagan feasts. The sacrifice of the heathens, or pagan peoples, were to idols and demons and not to God. He desired that Christians should not have any communion or participation with demons; it was not expedient for them to partake of the sacrament of the demons and the table of the Lord. The assumption here is that, in some way, a participation in the pagan feasts, or the Eucharist, involved also a participation in the nature of the deities.[3]

To Paul, the idols and demons were nothing but lifeless

---

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

matter and workers of iniquity; God and Jesus were the life-giving sources. In some mysterious way the life of the God is imparted to the worshipper through the medium of the elements, and the bread and wine become not merely emblems of sacrifice but the means or instrument by which the virtue of that sacrifice is appropriated by the participant.[4] The worshipper becomes ἔνθεοι — ἔνχριστῳ just as in the mystery religions the participants believe themselves to become ἔνθεοι through a common meal.[5]

J. A. Magni describes this belief as sympathetic magic:

> Primitive man believed that the qualities of a person or thing could be transferred by mere contact. But the surest way to assimilate such qualities was by eating and drinking. Now, whatever object was believed to be embodiment of the deity was therefore sacramentally eaten for the purpose of absorbing the divine attributes, and for renewing or strengthening the physical bond between the tribe and the totem god.[6]

With this interpretation of the Lord's Supper we can perceive that, according to Paul's doctrine, the Supper begins to take on the characteristics of a Sacrament. To whatever extent it was observed by the Christian Church as a memorial to show the Lord's death till He comes, it now begins to develop into a Sacrament in the Christian Church. Whether Paul borrowed from the current beliefs of his time in the

---

[4]Ibid., pp. 362-63.

[5]Kirsopp Lake, The Earlier Epistles of Saint Paul, Their Motive and Origin (2d. ed.; London: Rivingtons, 1927), pp. 213-14.

[6]Magni, op. cit.

development of the Christian Sacrament is a much debated question. "Sacramentarianism was prevalent in his time and had he borrowed the idea, it would not be a discredit to his doctrine."[7]

The account of the Synoptic Gospels referring to the Lord's Supper are considered alike from a general standpoint. In detail, however, they are not identical. The account of Mark is considered basic, and the Matthean account rests on Mark and additional sources. The Lucian account reverses the order of the bread and cup and in some accounts includes the statement, "This do in remembrance of me." This statement is considerably questioned and is believed to be not genuine. "So strong is the belief in this direction that Westcott and Hort, and several older works, have excised the account from the Lucian account."[8]

A similarity in these gospel accounts is that each refers to the Supper as a Covenant; Luke calls it a New Covenant. Gould, in the International Critical Commentary, states that the term, "covenant," is borrowed from the institution of the law, referring to the covenant between God and the Jews with Moses sprinkling the people with the blood of the sacrifice as a seal between them and God. The New

---

[7]Andrews, op. cit., pp. 369-70.

[8]Norman P. Williams, "The Origins of the Sacraments," Essays Catholic and Critical, ed. Edward Gordon (New York: Macmillan, 1926), p. 382.

Covenant, in which the law is established in the heart, is sealed with the blood of Him who died to make it a reality. This interpretation fixes the sacrificial meaning of the flesh and blood. Jesus uses the elements of bread and wine that are before him as symbolic of the sacrifice that he is about to make--a death that is not to mean the current idea of sacrifice but an illumined idea of sacrifice.[9]

The question still remains: Did Jesus intend to institute a sacrament? When we leave out the statement in Luke that is considered not genuine, "This do in remembrance of me," it is evident that none of the Gospels gives a command for the repetition of the Supper or for the continuance of it as an institution.

Not only is there no mention of a continuance but, when we consider that Jesus' eschatological outlook considered the world order on the point of dissolution and that the end might arrive at any moment, it is hard to believe that he could have intended to provide a long continuing movement of this kind.

There seems to be room for the belief from the statements in the Synoptics that the Lord's Supper is a survival of the Jewish "Kiddush," or feast, characterized by the blessing of wine and bread which Jesus and his followers consumed. The custom was continued by Jesus' followers with their club-meal or Agape to remind them of His death and His future return.

---

[9]Ezra P. Gould, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Mark," International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927), p. 265.

"For the first few years, then, these observances were merely a simple piece of symbolism without sacramental significance."[10]

In the Acts of the Apostles we find two passages that refer to the Lord's Supper. The first is found in chapter two, verses forty-two through forty-six; the second is in chapter twenty, verse seven.

The early group of followers in Jerusalem were still faithful in their Temple attendance and in the observance of the Jewish law. Nevertheless, the former passage mentioned above indicates that in addition to their faithfulness to the Jewish law they also had their daily services in private homes for the breaking of bread and prayer. These services served a double purpose. They were a bond of fellowship and a means of support for the needy. Those who were of the less well-to-do class were supplied by others who were more able to give support. This practice resulted in a form of communism--"they had all things in common." A more significant purpose than the above was that it served as a continuation and a reminder of the Lord's Last Supper with His disciples.[11]

The second passage reads: "And upon the first day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them." Between the time of the occurrence of this event and the one recorded in the first passage, a time of approximately twenty-five years intervenes. Bishop Ellicott tells us that from this passage it is evident that the Church

---

[11] Williston Walker, History of the Christian Church (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921), Period I, Section IV.

had already begun to observe the weekly festival of the resurrection on the first day of the week, in addition to the weekly Sabbath. It is also reasonable to assume that the observance had now taken on a weekly celebration in lieu of the former daily service. In any event, the Lord's Supper was still a social meal in form, taken as a reminder of the Lord's Last Supper with his disciples.

The major reference to the Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel is found in the sixth chapter in these words: "Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," (vs. 53). The author of the Fourth Gospel has introduced this sentence in his statement following the narration of the feeding of the five thousand. It is particularly noticeable that he has left out the record of the institution of the Supper which is related in each of the other Gospels. Yet, it is to be remembered that the Fourth Gospel is not to be considered as history; it is the theology of the author as he sees it in the period 90 to 100 A.D.

On the basis that the Gospel is pure theology for a certain period, we are concerned with the author's meaning of the sixth chapter and the verse quoted above. It is recognized that this chapter presents two views; the first is that the Eucharist is identified with the outward rite that was practiced in his day. The second point of view that is seen is the communication by Jesus of His own mind and spirit to His disciples through the elements. John recognizes the externality

of the observance of the rite and the worthlessness to the worshippers of the pure external performance. It was not his purpose to discard the rite or lessen the value of the tradition that rests behind the observance of the Eucharist. What he is attempting to do is to substitute a deeper, more religious conception of the Supper than was prevalent in the Church of his time. He had recognized the danger to the spiritual life of the Church that was inevitable through the external ordinance and consequently discovered in the agency of the Lord's Supper the means of lifting men to the higher conception and more spiritual plane of life that is of Christ.

For the author of the Fourth Gospel the Eucharist is the symbol of mystical union between the believer and the risen Christ. In some mysterious manner the divine life that was Christ's is communicated to the worshipper through the elements of bread and wine, which represent the actual flesh and blood of the Lord. To the author the Eucharist was a memorial from its external standpoint; yet, at the same time, it was a sacrament continuing eternally through the symbolic elements which, when eaten with a sense of the inward spiritual meaning, imparted to the believer the spiritual life of the Lord just as food is assimilated and imparts strength and matter to our bodies. "Always to become operative the sacrament must be accompanied by a belief in and a will to serve Christ."[12]

---

[12]Ernest F. Scott, The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology (2d. ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908), pp. 122-29.

CHAPTER IV

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS AND THE EUCHARIST

Near the end of the first century an unique conception arose in the Christian Church concerning the Eucharist and its meaning. The author of the Fourth Gospel views it as a means towards developing the spiritual life of the individual Christian and the Church of his day. To the author the Eucharist, or Lord's Supper, was an agency that would lift men to the higher conception and spiritual level of Christ. By some means, which are not fully explained by the author, there is imparted to the communicant a mystical union between the believer and Christ. Also in this mysterious manner, the divine life of Christ is given to the participant through the elements.

At the beginning of the second century of the Christian era, there came with the Apostolic Fathers an even greater development of the significance of the Eucharist. The teaching which is similar to that developed by the author of the Fourth Gospel but developed to a fuller degree of Sacramentarianism was evident in the Apostolic Age. To show this process of development let us now examine the writings of two of the Apostolic Fathers, Clement of Rome and Ignatius, with the view of using their thoughts on the subject as representative of the

teachings of the Church in that period on the meaning of the Eucharist.

The important work of Clement of Rome is his epistle to the Corinthians. A second epistle to the Corinthians can not be definitely identified as his work. By some scholars, nevertheless, it is ascribed to him. Little is mentioned by Clement of Rome with direct reference to the Eucharist. In his fortieth chapter of the first epistle, he states: "Those, therefore, who present their offerings at the appointed times are accpeted and blessed; for inasmuch as they follow the laws of the Lord, they sin not." This single reference is a little hard to connect with Clement's ideas on the sacrament. Adrian Fortesque in his work, The Mass, A Study of Roman Liturgy, states that the word used in the Greek text, προσφοραι, meaning "oblations," and translated above, "offerings," soon came to be the technical name for the offering of the Holy Eucharist. Here it may still include the offerings for the poor.[1]

Since Clement stated the above verse in his chapter on "Preserving the Order Appointed by God in the Church," and since Fortesque has interpreted it as referring to the Eucharist, it may be concluded that Clement recognized a particular value in the Eucharist. What the significance may have been to him from a doctrinal standpoint, he did not state. It is also evident that the Eucharist was observed at particular intervals in the time of Clement, being a law of the Church. Too, it is quite

---

[1]Adrian Fortesque, The Mass, A Study of Roman Liturgy (London: Longmans and Green Company, 1912), p. 20.

probable that the observance may have had some connection with the forgiveness of sins since "Clement stated that those who present their offerings are accepted and blessed."[2] The acceptance and blessing of the individual would seem to imply that he had been forgiven of his sins.

The Epistles of Ignatius have several references to the Eucharist. A careful scrutiny of each of these passages acquaints us with the importance and feeling that Ignatius attaches to the Supper. In his Epistle to the Smyrneans, Ignatius states with reference to heretics and unbelievers: "They abstain from the Eucharist and from prayers because they confess not the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins."[3]

In the Epistle to the Philadelphians, Ignatius insists that they have only "one faith, one preaching, one Eucharist. For there is one flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ."[4] His desire when he writes to the Romans in chapter seven was for the bread of God, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ,

---

[2]Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Cox, The First Epistle of Clement, Vol. I: Ante-Nicene Fathers (2d ed. rev.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), p. 16.

[3]Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Cox, The Epistle of Ignatius to Smyrneans, Vol. I: Ante-Nicene Fathers (2d ed. rev.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), p. 89.

[4]Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Cox, The Epistle of Ignatius to the Philadelphians, Vol. I: Ante-Nicene Fathers (2d ed. rev.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), p. 81.

the Son of God.[5]

The key statement of Ignatius on the Eucharist, however, is found in his Epistle to the Ephesians. His exhortation to them is to steadfastness and unity with an undivided mind, breaking one and the same bread which is the medicine of immortality and the antidote which prevents us from dying; a cleansing remedy driving away evil that we should live in God through Jesus Christ.[6]

Ignatius' conception of the Eucharist from the above statements is very much like that of the author of the Fourth Gospel in chapter six. The Eucharist is the life-giving substance which, when taken into the body by the worshipper, has a cleansing power and an ability to unite the participant with Christ. Ignatius' striking phrase, "medicine of immortality," indicates his similarity of belief to that of John, who stated: "Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood, ye do not have life." It is the guarantee of immortality and a means whereby on earth the participant is able to partake of eternal life.

In the age of the Apostolic Fathers, then, it may be concluded from the references in this chapter that the relatively simple ceremony of the Eucharist, as practiced in the early Church, rapidly began to develop into the Sacrament of the

---

[5]Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Cox, The Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans, Vol. I: Ante-Nicene Fathers (2d.ed. rev.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), pp. 76-77.

[6]Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Cox, The Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians, Vol. I: Ante-Nicene Fathers (2d ed. rev.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), p. 56.

Lord's Supper, forming the basis of Christian liturgy as practiced in later centuries by the Roman Catholic Church. The statement by Ignatius very ably expressed this change when he wrote that the Sacrament is the "medicine of Immortality." The idea that the sacrament contained the power to give spiritual life and union with Christ began to receive recognition in that era as being factual rather than mere theology.

CHAPTER V

THE HERETICAL SECTS AND THE EUCHARIST

Gnosticism is a name for a number of syncretistic religious systems that prevailed in the East both prior to, and after, the beginning of the Christian era. Its leaders were not skeptics nor atheists, but men who were deeply interested and concerned for practical motives in the problems of religion. The earliest Gnostic developments were from Judaistic influences; however, there were Hellenistic and Christian influences evident as well.

There are several particular characteristics of the Gnostics that may be noted. First, Gnosticism affirmed the existence of God--in fact, the existence of two gods. The Creator of the world is not the Supreme God, but the Creator is either a subordinate, though not hostile instrument, or an inferior, antagonistic being. Hence, the God of the Old Testament is not the God who sends the Redeemer into the world but is another being, the Demiurge.[1] Secondly, with reference to the Redeemer, the Gnostics admit the existence of Christ. There was a moderate conception which allowed his manhood to be real. Cerinthus, according to Irenaeus, represented Jesus as not

---

[1]George P. Fisher, History of Christian Doctrine (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), pp. 52-53.

having been born of a virgin but as having been the son of Mary and Joseph.[2] The more advanced and consistent view of the Gnostics insisted that the Incarnation was visionary from first to last. If the Redeemer seemed to have a body, it was not real; and, if he seemed to eat and drink and suffer pain, it was no more than seeming. The one thing evident was that the Redeemer who came to deliver us from matter could not come in a material body.[3] His whole appearance suggested phantasm and ghostliness. The death on the cross was considered only an optical illusion. Since his body was only an "apparent body," he could not have been crucified in the flesh.

A third peculiarity pertaining to the Gnostics was their conception of evil. All matter or material of the world was evil; there was no union of the flesh and the spirit. Flesh was matter, and matter could not unite with spirit. Therefore, since the material world was evil, Christ could not have had a real incarnation. He was the highest of the Aeons of the world above. Being spirit, he could not have taken on a fleshly material body.[4] Any appearance, then, of Jesus in bodily form could not be real.

Since all matter was evil, salvation consisted in over-

---

[2]Joseph C. Ayer, A Source Book for Ancient Church History (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), p. 81.

[3]Henry M. Gwatkin, Early Church History to A.D. 313 (London: Macmillan, 1927), II, 28.

[4]Walker, op. cit., p. 55.

coming and eliminating matter which is accomplished through "knowledge," γνῶσις , and asceticism. The term, "knowledge," in this use is not to be confused with the meaning now commonly understood. Knowledge, or γνῶσις , in this sense, was always a mystical knowledge, or revelation, not accessible to those outside the Gnostic group. It was not to be proved but believed by the initiate and guarded as a secret.[5] It was through this type of knowledge or revelation that the initiate was brought to a full understanding of the universe and was saved from the evil world of matter.

Unfortunately, there is a dearth of material as to the position of the Gnostics on the Christian Eucharist; nevertheless, their attitude may be inferred from the conception that they advanced pertaining to evil and to Christ. Since the Christ to them possessed only an apparent body, it is logical to assume that the words uttered by Jesus at the Last Supper, "This is my body," would be entirely meaningless. Again, their conception of matter as being evil would seem to imply that the elements of the Christian Eucharist could have no meaning for them since they were matter in themselves. Neither would there be any need for them to observe the Eucharistic service in the Christian manner when they did not subscribe to the Christian significance of the broken body and shed blood. Their entire emphasis having been placed on knowledge and philosophy for

---

[5]"Gnosticism," The Encyclopedia Brittannica, 14th ed., Vol. II.

salvation excluded any need for the Eucharistic service. However, the Acta Thomas in speaking of the Gnostics refer to a substitute for the Christian Eucharist. "The rite was merely the breaking of the bread without the use of the cup. What formula of consecration was used is not known."[6]

The two important heretical sects existing in the first two centuries in addition to the various Gnostic groups were the Ebionites and the Montanists.

The Ebionites were divided into two groups, the Nazarenes and the Pharisaic. The Nazarenes were the more moderate group. They accepted the miraculous birth of Christ; they made no objection to suffering and death as connected with the Messiah. They attached great importance to the baptism of Jesus and asserted Paul to be a true Apostle. The less tolerant group, the Pharisaic Ebionites, insisted that the Mosaic ceremonials were still binding on the Christian; especially did they insist on circumcision as necessary for salvation. They denied the miraculous conception of Jesus and looked upon him as a Jew distinguished from others by his fulfillment of the Law. He was selected as Messiah because of his legal piety.[7]

Montanism was a more or less reactionary movement against ecclesiasticism. The early Hope that had been characteristic of the Apostolic Church had grown dim. The consciousness of the constant inspiration of the Spirit which

---

[6]J. P. Anderson, "Gnosticism," The Catholic Encyclopedia, ed. Charles G. Herbernan and others, VI (1913), 597.

[7]Fisher, op. cit., pp. 48-49.

had existed in the early Church had largely faded. Consequently, Montanus, or Phrygia, led an effort to revive the inspiration of the Spirit combined with a fresh outburst of the early prophetic enthusiasm. Along with these he asserted his belief in the early approaching end of the world-age. In beginning his movement, Montanus, in 156, proclaimed himself the passive instrument through whom the Holy Spirit spoke. To him were attached two prophetesses who claimed to be the mouthpieces of the Spirit. Together this group began to proclaim the fast approaching end of the world and to recommend the most strenuous asceticism, fastings, celibacy, and abstinence from meat.[8]

Unfortunately, there is little reference to the use these sects made of the Eucharist. Their beliefs in Jesus and the expectation of His speedy return at the approaching end of the world would furnish some ground for the belief that the sacrament was observed. Beveridge, in an article in Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, states that the Ebionites had a leaning toward Gnosticism and did observe the Lord's Supper using bread and water as elements.[9] In all probability the use of water was substituted for the wine since it is known that the Ebionites were opposed to using wine.[10] An article

---

[8]Walker, op. cit., Period II, pp. 58-59.

[9]W. Beveridge, "Ebionism," Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings, V (1916), 144.

[10]Robert T. Kerlin, The Church of the Fathers (Nashville: Publishing House of the M.E. Church, South, 1901), p. 86.

by Chapman, in The Catholic Encyclopedia, states that a certain group of them used bread and cheese in the observance of their sacrament.[11] What significance is attached to the use of these elements in their rites is not known. Probably they compared with the sacraments and rites practiced by the mystery religions with which they came in slight contact.

---

[11]John Chapman, "Montanists," The Catholic Encyclopedia, ed. Charles G. Herbermann and others, X (1913), 521-22.

CHAPTER VI

THE ATTITUDE OF THE APOLOGISTS

The period of the Apologists extends from the first quarter of the second century to the fourth quarter of the same century. The group of defenders include Quadratus, Aristides, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Melito, Bishop of Sardis, and Athenogoras. Justin Martyr is by far the most outstanding figure of the group. His work is more extensive and significant of the opinion of the Apologists generally. Due to this factor, the treatment of this chapter will be entirely from the viewpoint of Justin Martyr.

In The First Apology of Justin, chapters sixty-five, sixty-six, and sixty-seven refer to the Eucharist. Chapter sixty-five refers to the Eucharist as it is administered after the baptismal rite. When the candidate had assented to the Christian belief and had been baptized he was led to an assembly of the brethren, already baptized, where prayers were said and greetings were extended by kissing one another. Then there was brought to the leader of the group bread and a cup of wine mixed with water. Over these elements praise and glory were extended to God in the name of the Son and the Holy Ghost; thanks were offered at considerable length for being counted worthy of the elements. After the service of prayer the deacons distributed

the elements to those present; to those absent a portion was carried away.[1]

Chapter sixty-six is apparently well worth incorporating in the words of Justin:

> And this food is called among us εὐχαριστία, (literally, thanksgiving), of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is remission of sins, and unto regeneration, and who is so living as Christ has enjoined. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these, but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His Word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. For the Apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called the Gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them; that Jesus took bread, and when He had given thanks, said, "This do ye in remembrance of Me, this is My body;" and that after the same manner, having taken the cup and given thanks, He said, "This is My blood," and gave it to them alone. . . . Which the wicked devils have imitated in the mysteries of Mithras, commanding the same to be done. For, that bread and a cup of water are placed with certain incantations in the mystic rites of one who is being initiated, you either know or can learn.[2]

The third reference Justin makes to the Eucharist, in the sixty-seventh chapter of his First Apology, states specifically the time that the Eucharist was observed. On the day called Sunday, all who lived in cities or in the country gathered together in one place; lessons were read and prayers were offered. Then, the bread, wine, and water were brought forward to be consecrated and distribution was made by the

---

[1]Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Cox, The First Apology of Justin, Vol. I: The Ante-Nicene Fathers (2d ed. rev.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), chap. lxv, p. 185.

[2]Ibid., chap. lxvi, p. 185.

deacons.[3]

In these references Justin has described the Eucharist as a rite following immediately upon baptism; it is at this time that the candidate, who has received the washing and has been cleansed, is admitted to the celebration of the service which the others already baptized observed from Sunday to Sunday.

Perhaps the sixty-sixth chapter is the richest in information on the Supper. We notice that the word, "Eucharist," is now clearly the technical term for the rite. It is also quite obviously stated that the rite was not one to be promiscuously practiced; only the ones who <u>believed</u> in the truth of the teachings of the Christians and Apologists, who had been <u>baptized</u> with the washing that was for the remission of sins and unto regeneration, and who were <u>living</u> as Christ had requested were permitted to participate. The discrimination made according to the three requirements mentioned above implies, says Adrian Fortesque, in his book, <u>The Mass, A Study of the Roman Liturgy</u>, " . . . that the wicked people were possibly excommunicated."[4]

Another interesting feature of Justin's conception of the Eucharist is his assignment of the institution of it to Jesus as stated in the Gospels. Nevertheless, the quotation that he has given as the words of Jesus on the occasion of the

---

[3] <u>Ibid.</u>, chap. lxvii, p. 185.

[4] Fortesque, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 21.

Last Supper do not agree exactly with any that the evangelists made. The quotation does more nearly approximate what the Apostle states in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, chapter eleven.

The most important statement of Justin on the Eucharist is his conception of what the elements of the rite actually consisted. To him it was not common bread and wine that was received. As Jesus Christ, the Saviour, became flesh and blood for the salvation of mankind by the Word of God, the food which was blessed by the prayer of His Word and which nourished their bodies by transmutation became the flesh and blood of Jesus himself. It became the Eucharist at the prayer of Jesus who was the Word proceeding from God. The mighty Word of God caused the Incarnation in the same way that the Word of Prayer coming from Christ caused the consecration of the Eucharist. The expression, "prayer of His Word," would in all probability refer to the prayer offered by Jesus himself at the time of the original consecration of the elements themselves.

While Justin did not hold to the later elaborate doctrine of transubstantiation, he did hold a doctrine of conversion of the elements. Certainly he believed that the elements had been transformed at the time of the prayer of consecration. They were no longer common bread and common drink. On the other hand, he definitely stated that the elements were the flesh and blood of Jesus. This teaching has been advocated by Calvinists, Lutherans, and Romanists.[5] The idea of Justin, according to

---

[5]Justin Martyr, op. cit., chap. lxvi, p. 185.

George Fisher, appears to be " . . . that the divine Logos, or Word, is mysteriously presented in the bread and wine as in the Incarnate Christ."[6] It would seem that Justin's idea of the Eucharist recognized a transformation of the bread and the wine; yet, the elements continued to contain the nature of their physical properties. The idea is very adequately expressed by Gelasius, Bishop of Rome, in 490 A.D., as follows: "By the sacraments we are made partakers of the divine nature, and yet the substance and nature of bread and wine do not cease to be in them."[7]

---

[6]Fisher, op. cit., p. 68. [7]Justin Martyr, op. cit.

CHAPTER VII

THE CONCEPTIONS OF IRENAEUS AND TERTULLIAN CONCERNING THE EUCHARIST

Saint Irenaeus, one of the Church Fathers and a Bishop of Lyons, was born in Proconsular, Asia, probably in the year 130 A.D. Because of his many works written in Greek he has been given an exceptional place in Christian literature. His writings deal with controverted religious questions and give the testimony of one who has heard and conversed with men of the Apostolic Age, such as Saint Polycarp and Saint John.[1]

Irenaeus' most outstanding piece of work was his Adversus Haereses which was devoted to the detection and overthrow of false knowledge and heresy. In the several volumes of the Haereses Irenaeus refers to the Eucharist and gives his interpretation of its meaning.

His first reference states that offerings were made according to Christ's command.

> Again, giving instructions to His Disciples to offer to God the first fruits of His own created things . . . not as if He stood in need of them, but that they might be themselves neither unfruitful nor ungrateful. . . . He took that created thing, bread, and gave thanks, and said, "This is my body." And the cup likewise, which is part of that

---

[1]Albert Poncelet, "Irenaeus," The Catholic Encyclopedia, ed. Charles G. Herbermann and others, VIII (1913), 130-131.

creation to which we belong. He confessed to His blood, and taught the new oblation of the new covenant.[2]

Irenaeus had evidently conceived of the rite as a sacrifice that was enjoined upon the disciples through which they might glorify God. The Last Supper, to him, also appeared to be a sacrificial meal of which Jesus had taken advantage to institute His memorial. He is careful to relate that Jesus had called these earthly elements of bread and wine, His body and blood. Through these elements, representing the Christ, the new oblation of the new covenant was taught. In every place should this sacrifice be offered to Him as His name glorified among the Gentiles.[3]

Like Justin Martyr, Irenaeus held the conception that the bread and wine were no longer elements. He conceived of a change in the elements when the invocation of God was pronounced over them, and yet the bread and wine did not lose the nature of their physical properties. Irenaeus states that " . . . as the bread which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly."[4]

Irenaeus was quite confident that the earthly elements of bread and wine were taken possession by the divine Logos

---

[2]Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Cox, Irenaeus Adverses Haereses, Vol. I: The Ante-Nicene Fathers (2d ed. rev.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), chap. xvii, p. 484.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ibid., p. 486.

which mysteriously connected itself with them at the time of the consecration. As to the form of the consecration that Irenaeus used in transforming the elements into the Eucharist, there is no record. His reference to it in his quotation above merely calls it an "invocation of God."

Irenaeus' conception of the Eucharist is also similar to that of the Fourth Gospel and of Ignatius. The author of the Fourth Gospel held the conception that in some mysterious manner the divine life that was Christ's was communicated to the worshipper when the rite was celebrated. Ignatius calls the Eucharist the "medicine of immortality and the antidote which prevents us from dying." Irenaeus continued to develop this thought of the Supper conferring "life" on the worshipper. There is, of course, the material nourishment that the body receives from receiving the elements, but there is a life that is conferred which is of a higher significance. Just as this bread, which is produced of the earth and is consecrated with the invocation of God, becomes thereby more than ordinary bread and consists of two realities--earthly and heavenly--

" . . . so also our bodies when they receive the Eucharist are no longer contemptible, having the hope of the resurrection to eternity."5 Thus the heavenly power, the divine Logos, which has come into the bread makes our bodies no longer corrupt. The change that has taken place in the elements at the time of consecration causes a corresponding change in man when they are

---

[5] Ibid.

partaken. The sincere worshipper leaves off the corruptible nature and puts on the incorruptible with the hope of resurrection and life eternal.

How far these conceptions of Irenaeus were influenced by the Mystery Religions cannot be known. It is true that the Mysteries shared the belief that by a common meal the nature of their God could be attained. Probably Irenaeus' conceptions were attained by the same habit of thought though with a deeper spiritual conception.[6]

Irenaeus used his doctrine to refute the inconsistencies of some groups who maintained that the Father was not the Creator. Those who maintain that material things originated through apostasy, ignorance, and passion sin against the Father when offering unto Him the fruits of their apostasy. They subject Him to insult with their offering instead of giving Him thanks. Irenaeus asks:

> How can they be consistent with themselves, when they say that the bread over which thanks have been given is the body of their Lord, and the cup His blood if they do not call Himself the Son of the Creator of the world, that is, His Word, through whom the wood fructifies and the fountains gust forth, and the earth gives "first the blade and then the ear, then the full corn in the ear"?

Any celebration of the Eucharist by these groups was to Irenaeus nothing but a mockery, a sin, and an insult to the Father.

In regard to the hope of the resurrection and life-giving property of the elements, Irenaeus asks:

---

[6]Walker, op. cit., p. 98. [7]Irenaeus, op. cit.

> How can they say that the flesh which is nourished with the body of the Lord, and with his blood, goes to corruption and does not partake of life? Let them cease; therefore, either alter their opinion, or cease from offering the things mentioned.[8]

The body could not become corrupt for Irenaeus if there were any virtue in the Eucharist; there certainly was virtue in it for him. The elements had acquired a heavenly nature; therefore, these heretical sects must alter their opinions or deny the life-giving quality of the elements that had become the body and blood of the Christ.

Irenaeus also bears witness to the practice of sending the Eucharist to those who were absent from the celebration, even to bishops as a sign of peace and inter-communion.[9]

Thus we see Irenaeus' position on the Eucharist by assigning it to Christ as the originator. He also recognizes a change in the elements at the time of their consecration; he realizes that they possess a life-giving property that not only nourishes man physically but also spiritually.

Tertullian was the son of a centurion in the pro-consular service and was probably born in the year 160 A.D., at Carthage. In his early life he was evidently a follower of the legal profession and was well acquainted with Roman law. His conversion was not later than 197 A.D., after which he embraced the Faith with all the ardor of his nature. After his conversion he began and completed the writing of many treatises and epistles on religious subjects. At the time of his death

---

[8] Ibid. [9] Fortesque, op. cit., p. 27.

his works were quite numerous.[10]

A number of Tertullian's works make reference to the Eucharistic service which surmise his conception of this rite. Tertullian speaks of the Eucharist by several different terms. In the "De Fuga in Persecutione," he refers to it as the demonica solemnia--"the solemnities of the Lord"; in the "De Praescriptionibus Haereticorum," he calls the Eucharist the offering of bread. Again, in the same work, it is spoken of merely as the Eucharist. "Ad Uxorem II" refers to it as the feast of God; the "De Oratione," says that it is the Lord's Passion. In addition to these terms Tertullian is constantly referring to the rite as a sacrifice.[11] Harnack declares that the whole transaction of the Supper as a sacrifice is found in the Didache, in Ignatius, in Justin Martyr, and in Clement of Rome. Harnack also goes further and gives several reasons for calling the Supper a sacrifice:

> First, in Malachi 1:11, there is demanded a solemn Christian sacrifice--("For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen, said the Lord of hosts"). Second, all prayers were regarded as a sacrifice, and therefore the prayers of the Supper must be especially considered as such. Third, payments in kind were necessary for the age connected with the Supper from which the bread and wine were taken. These offerings were regarded as sacrifices.[12]

---

[10]John Chapman, "Tertullian," The Catholic Encyclopedia, ed. Charles G. Herbermann and others, XIV (1913), p. 50.

[11]Fortesque, op. cit., p. 39.

[12]Adolph Harnack, History of Dogma (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1897), p. 309.

Consequently, the Church had built a conception of the rite as a sacrifice, and Tertullian was referring to it by the term generally applied in his day.

Tertullian was also quite strict in his belief concerning the celebration of the Eucharist. Fortesque exclaims that Tertullian reproached certain heretics for allowing their catechumens to remain for the consecration and communion service.[13] For Tertullian, the Eucharistic rite was to be celebrated only by the baptized brethren. Any who may have been candidates for the Church or who were not yet baptized and in full membership were not permitted to remain and witness the consecration and distribution of the elements.

Tertullian also states that the celebration of the Eucharist was by the entire congregation at a service held just before daybreak. No one had the authority to consecrate and deliver the elements of bread and wine to them except the presidents or Bishops of their groups. The Lord had commanded that the Eucharist be eaten at meal-times and be taken by all alike--men and women, rich and poor.[14]

The feeling of Tertullian and the Christian of his day for the sacredness of the elements is indicated by the fact that they were considerably pained whenever any one, through carelessness or other reason, allowed the bread or wine to be cast

---

[13]Fortesque, op. cit., p. 40.

[14]Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Cox, Tertullian De Coroma, Vol. III: The Ante-Nicene Fathers (2d ed. rev.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), p. 94.

upon the ground. This feeling was expressed even though the bread and wine may have been their own.[15]

One of the most interesting statements that Tertullian makes in connection with the Eucharist is in a defense against Marcion. Referring to Christ's institution of the rite, Tertullian says:

> When He so earnestly expressed His desire to eat the Passover, He considered it His Own feast; for it would have been unworthy of God to desire to partake of what was not His own. Then, having taken the bread and given it to His disciples, He made it His own body, by saying, "This is my body," that is, the figure of my body. A figure, however, there could not have been, unless there were first a veritable body.[16]

Tertullian's argument in this statement would seem on the surface to imply a real presence in the elements, especially when reference is made to the words, "He made it His own Body," by saying, "'This is my Body.'" Nevertheless, this argument is weakened by his statement that the elements are a symbol of His Body. This fact apparently discounts a belief in the real presence of the Body of Jesus in the consecrated elements. Consequently, nothing can be said definitely for Tertullian for or against a Real Presence. His symbolical use is an attempt not to create reality in the elements but the effect of the reality.[17]

---

[15]Tertullian, op. cit.

[16]Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Cox, Tertullian Against Marcion, Vol. III: The Ante Nicene Fathers (2d ed. rev.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), p. 418.

[17]E. C. Ratcliffe, "Eucharist," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th ed., VIII (1929), 795.

CONCLUSION

While Jesus, Paul, or some one else may have instituted the Christian Eucharist, and which may never be proven to everyone's satisfaction, one thing of which the unbiased investigator may be quite sure is the fact that the rite is rooted in a Jewish background with the Passover setting. Before the coming of Christ, the Jewish nation was strict to observe the Passover feast. After the coming of Christ, the Judaistic religion and its ceremonies continued to be practiced. Jesus, himself, being a good Jew, celebrated the Passover at the proper season, using the last "Passover Season" of His celebration as the opportunity to institute the symbolic and memorial service known as the Lord's Supper.

During the first few years of the Christian era, the Church celebrated the memorial at frequent intervals with large gatherings and amid much extravagance and intemperance. The Supper, assuming the character of a memorial feast, was observed to commemorate the Lord who was expected to return at any moment. When the return of the Lord was delayed and some Christians began to doubt the teaching of the Apostles, the rite at this time assumed a new meaning--a memorial of the death and resurrection of the Christ. Canonical attitudes especially refer to it as a rite to be celebrated by all Christians in commemoration of Jesus Christ. The Apostle Paul especially regarded the

Eucharist as a memorial feast and takes the Corinthians to task for their intemperate manner of celebration. His passage alone quotes Jesus as saying: "This do in remembrance of me . . . for as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He comes."[1]

By the time of the writing of the Didache, 80 to 120 A.D., the simple ceremony of the Eucharist began to be developed by the Church into a rite or sacrament. While the Didache represents the Eucharist in its simplest form, it at the same time held a requirement that was binding upon those who were to participate in the service: "Let no one eat or drink of this Eucharistic thanksgiving but they that have been baptized in the name of the Lord." Thus, baptism came to be required of the Christian before they were admitted to the Eucharistic service.

In the latter half of the first century and the first half of the second century of the Christian religion, a different conception of the Eucharist came into prominence among Church leaders. The author of the Fourth Gospel viewed it as a means towards developing the spiritual life of the individual and of the Church of his time. The Eucharist, or Sacrament, for the author of the Fourth Gospel was an agency that would lift men to the higher conception and spiritual level of Christ. By some means there was imparted to the communicant a mystical union between the believer and Christ. In some mysterious manner the divine life of Christ was given to the participant

---

[1] I Cor. 11:24-26.

through the elements.

With the Apostolic Fathers at the beginning of the second century there came an even greater development of the significance of the Eucharist. Their idea was very similar to that developed by the author of the Fourth Gospel. Ignatius very ably expressed the sentiment of the period when he said that the Sacrament was the "medicine of immortality."[2] The idea that the Sacrament possessed an ability to give spiritual life and union with Christ had become quite prevalent in that period. The opinions of the Church Fathers were, to a great extent, like those of John who insisted that life eternal only came from having eaten the flesh and having drunk the blood of the Saviour.

By the time of the appearance of the Apologists in the defense of Christianity we find new requirements concerning the Eucharist. There was a more strict belief concerning the property of elements themselves. While they did not lose the physical nature that they formerly had had as bread and wine, it was believed that some transformation had taken place at the time of the consecration of the elements. There were also three requirements by that time before one could participate in the service. First, he must believe that the teachings of the Apologists and Christians generally were true. Secondly, he must have been baptized for the remission of sins. Thirdly, he must be living the Christian type of life that Jesus had re-

---

[2]Roberts, op. cit.

quested. These features indicate the growing importance attached to the Eucharist and the doctrinal development that was slowly taking place as Christianity lived on.

When we come to the time of Irenaeus and Tertullian the belief concerning the Eucharist becomes more or less fixed for a considerable length of time. These men conceived of the rite as a sacrifice. The elements used ceased to be merely the common elements of bread and wine. They were no longer common elements after the prayer of consecration had been said over them. For Irenaeus, these elements were possessed of the divine Logos which man, in turn, received into himself when he partook of the elements. Just as the elements were changed at the consecration, likewise, was there also a change in the participant on receipt of the elements in his body.

While it cannot be said that these lines of development in the Eucharist admit of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, as we know it in a later age, it must be acknowledged that the Eucharist, while it retained its natural physical properties, was certainly believed to have been transformed in some way at the time that the elements were consecrated for their symbolic use.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Ayer, Joseph Cullen. A Source Book for Ancient Church. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Banks, John S. A Manual of Church Doctrine. Nashville: Publishing House of M.E. Church, South, 1910.

Bacon, Benjamin Wisner. Studies in Matthew. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1930.

_____. The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918.

Bartlett, J. Vernon. The New Century Bible. Vol. XXVI: The Acts. New York: Henry Frowde, n.d.

Bennett, W. H. The New Century Bible. Vol. II: Exodus. New York: Henry Frowde, n.d.

Bernard, J. H. International Critical Commentary. Vol. II: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint John. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.

Bevan, Edwyn R. The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge. New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1929.

Bruce, A. B. Expositor's Greek Testament. "Matthew." 6th edition. Edited by W. R. Nicoll. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1910.

Dodgson, C. Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church. "Tertullian." London: Parker and Rivington, 1854.

Driver, S. R. The International Critical Commentary. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy." New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.

Fisher, George P. History of Christian Doctrine. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

Foakes, Jackson F. The History of the Christian Church from the Earliest Times to A.D. 461. New York: Richard R. Smith Inc., 1930.

Fortesque, Adrian. The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1912.

Gardner, Percy. The Ephesian Gospel. London: Williams and Norgate, 1915.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. Strange New Gospels. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931.

Gould, Ezra P. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Mark. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

Gwatkin, Henry Melvill. Early Christian History to A.D. 313. Vol. II. London: Macmillan, 1927.

Harnack, Adolph. History of Dogma. 2 vols. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1897.

Hitchcock, Roswell, and Brown, Francis (eds.). Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884.

Kerlin, Robert T. The Church of the Fathers. Nashville: Publishing House of the M.E. Church, South, 1901.

Lake, Kirsopp. The Earlier Epistles of Saint Paul. 2d edition. London: Rivington, 1927.

Lightfoot, J. B., and Harner, J. R. (eds.). The Apostolic Fathers. London: Macmillan, 1912.

McClymount, J. A. (ed.). New Century Bible. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

McGiffert, Arthur C. A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age. Revised ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

Muilenburg, James. The Literary Relations of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1926.

Quasten, Jonannes, and Plumpe, Joseph C. (eds.). Ancient Christian Writers. Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1948.

Roberts, Alexander, Donaldson, James, and Cox, Cleveland A. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. I: Irenaeus Adverses Haereses. 2d ed. revised. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

_____. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. I: The Epistle of Ignatius to Smyrneans. 2d ed. revised. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

_____. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. I: The Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians. 2d ed. revised. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

_____. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. I: The Epistle of Ignatius to the Philadelphians. 2d ed. revised. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

_____. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. I: The Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans. 2d ed. revised. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

_____. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. I: The First Apology of Justin. 2d ed. revised. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

_____. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. I: The First Epistle of Clement. 2d ed. revised. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

_____. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. III: Tertullian Against Marcion. 2d ed. revised. New York: Charles Scribner's sons, 1899.

_____. Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. III: Tertullian De Coroma. 2d ed. revised. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

Robertson, Archibald, and Plummer, Alfred. International Critical Commentary. Vol. II: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. New Century Bible. "Deuteronomy and Joshua." New York: Henry Frowde, n.d.

Robinson, J. Armitage. Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache. London: The Macmillan Company, 1920.

Robinson, William. Completing the Reformation. Lexington: The College of the Bible, 1955.

Schaff, Philip. The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. 3rd ed. revised. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1889.

Scott, Ernest F. *The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology*. 2d edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908.

Seeberg, Reinhold. Textbooks of the History of Doctrine. Revised ed. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1905.

Short, Howard E. Doctrine and Thought of the Disciples of Christ. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1958.

Stendahl, Krister (ed.). The Scrolls and the New Testament. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957.

Stevens, Wm. Arnold, and Burton, E. DeWitt. A History of the Gospels. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.

Torrey, Charles C. Documents of the Primitive Church. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1941.

Walker, Williston. A History of the Christian Church. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.

Westcott, B. F. The Gospel according to Saint John. London: John Murray, 1886.

Williams, Norman P. Essays Catholic and Critical. New York: Macmillan, 1926.

Articles

Anderson, J. P. "Gnosticism," The Catholic Encyclopedia, ed. Charles G. Herbermann and others, VI (1913), 597.

Andrews, Herbert T. "The Place of the Sacraments in the Teachings of Saint Paul," The Expositor, VIII (March, 1916), 361-62.

Beveridge, W. "Ebionism," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings, V (1916), 144.

Chapman, John. "Montanists," The Catholic Encyclopedia, ed. Charles G. Herbermann and others, X (1913), 521-22.

_____. "Tertullian," The Catholic Encyclopedia, ed. Charles G. Herbermann and others, XIV (1913), 50.

"Eucharist," Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th ed., Vol. VIII.

Lawlor, H. J. "Montanism," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings, VIII (1916).

Moulton, W. J. "Passover," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings, IX (1900), 684.

Peterson, John B. "Apostolic Fathers," The Catholic Encyclopedia, ed. Charles G. Herbermann and others, I (1913).